UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,605	10/03/2003	Brian Richard Taraci	74200.926	6151

22804 7590 12/21/2007

THE HECKER LAW GROUP
1925 CENTURY PARK EAST
SUITE 2300
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER	
CHEA, PHILIP J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2153	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/678,605	TARACI, BRIAN RICHARD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Philip J. Chea	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/04; 11/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-32 have been examined.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 17 and 32 objected to because of the following informalities: Note line 3 of claims 17 and 32, "comrpising" is apparently "comprising". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Choi et al. (US 7,293,236), herein referred to as Choi.

As per claims 1,2, Choi discloses an apparatus for providing universal web access functionality, as claimed, comprising:

a first electronic device having a plurality of configurable Input/Output ports (see Fig. 1, *where first electronic device is considered control point [100]*, and column 4, lines 7-12, *describing a plurality of ports*);

a network connection to said first electronic device on a first one of said plurality of configurable Input/Output ports (see column 4, lines 7-12, *where a network connection is considered an Internet connection to the electronic device [100]).*

at least one second electronic device connected to said first electronic device on a second one of said plurality of configurable Input/Output ports (see Fig. 1, *showing how a second device washing machine [150b] is connected and column 4, lines 7-12, describing possible Input/Output port*

connections), wherein said first electronic device serves web pages associated with said at least one second electronic device (see Fig. 1 [110], *showing how first electronic device serves a guiding web page*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-5,10-12,15,18-20,25-27,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. (US 7,293,236), herein referred to as Choi, and further in view of Schwartz et al. (US 6,836,796), herein referred to as Schwartz.

As per claims 3,18, Choi discloses an apparatus for providing universal web access functionality, as claimed, comprising:

a plurality of configurable Input/Output ports for connection to at least one electronic device (see Fig. 1, *where electronic device is considered washing machine [150b]*, and column 4, lines 7-12, *describing a plurality of ports that can be used to connect to the at least one electronic device*);

a server engine providing access to said at least one electronic device via said plurality of configurable Input/Output ports (see Fig. 1, *showing how an apparatus [100] contains a server engine that displays a web page [110] to give access to electronic device [150b], via the ports described in* column 4, lines 7-12).

Although the system disclosed by Choi shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose an interface device providing remote connectivity to said server engine via a network.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Choi, as evidenced by Schwartz.

In an analogous art, Schwartz discloses a system for connecting network enabled devices to a DMS (device management system) (see Abstract), where the DMS has a server engine that allows remote connectivity to the DMS (see column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 6 and column 4, lines 18-22, *describing how the DMS is used as an intermediary and allows a terminal (i.e. interface device) to remotely access the DMS system via a network to manage the devices)*.

Given the teaching of Schwartz, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Choi by employing an interface device providing remote connectivity to said server engine via a network, such as disclosed by Schwartz, in order to remotely control the devices external to the network the devices are located.

As per claims 4,19, Choi further discloses that the plurality of configurable ports comprise analog ports (see column 4, lines 7-12, *where analog ports are considered HPNA)*.

As per claims 5,20, Choi further discloses that the plurality of configurable ports comprise digital ports (see column 4, lines 7-12, *where digital ports are considered IEEE 1394*).

As per claims 10,25, Choi further discloses that the plurality of configurable ports comprise general purpose ports (see column 4, lines 7-12).

As per claims 11,26, Schwartz further discloses that the interface device comprises a configurable graphical user interface (see column 4, lines 18-22).

As per claims 12,27, Schwartz further discloses that the interface device comprises a network interface card (see column 4, lines 18-22, *where interacting through network [102] inherently comprises a network interface card to connect to network [102]*).

As per claims 15,30, Choi further discloses that at least one electronic device is not web enabled (see column 4, lines 7-12, *where the device that connects via IEEE 1394 is not web enabled*).

6. Claims 6-9,21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Schwartz as applied to claims 3 and 18 above, and further in view of Axelson ("Serial Port Central").

As per claims 6-9,21-25, although the system disclosed by Choi shows the use of serial I/O ports such as the IEEE 1394, it fails to disclose serial ports such as the RS-232, RS-422, RS-485 and an IR port.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Choi in view of Schwartz, as evidenced by Axelson.

In an analogous art, Axelson discloses old and well known serial port communication standards that are used to connect devices (see pages 5 and 6, "Interface Standards", *describing how the TIA develops and publishes RS-232, RS-422, and RS-485 standards and* page 5,"Infrared (IR)", *describing the specification of IR ports)*.

Given the teaching of Axelson, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Choi in view of Schwartz by employing different I/O ports that support serial communications, such as disclosed by Axelson, in order to monitor products that have serial communication capabilities (see Axelson page 2, "Products: Cards, Converters, Cables, and Code", *describing many products that use serial communication, which can potentially be monitored by the system of Choi in view of Schwartz if combined with Axelson*).

7. Claims 13,28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Schwartz as applied to claims 12,27 above, and further in view of Computer Hope ("Computer Hardware").

As per claims 13,28 although the system disclosed by Choi in view of Schwartz shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the network interface card comprises an RJ-45 connector.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Choi in view of Schwartz, as evidenced by Computer Hope.

In an analogous art, Computer Hope discloses the components of a network interface card (see page 1, "NIC ABCs") and how an RJ45 connector is one of the most popular types of connections used with computer networks (see page 2, "RJ45").

Given the teaching of Computer Hope, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Choi in view of Schwartz by employing an interface card with an RJ45 connector, such as disclosed by Computer Hope, in order to be compatible with most connections used in computer networks.

8. Claims 14,29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Schwartz as applied to claims 12,27 above, and further in view of Fifield (US 7,130,670).

As per claims 14,29, although the system disclosed by Choi shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the network interface card comprises a wireless connector.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Choi, as evidenced by Fifield.

In an analogous art, Fifield discloses a wireless network card with interchangeable antennas (see Abstract).

Given the teaching of Fifield, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Choi by employing a wireless network card, such as disclosed by Fifield, in order to gain access to a network without bringing a network cable.

9. Claims 16-17 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Schwartz as applied to claims 3,18 above, and further in view of McConnell et al. (US 6,822,954), herein referred to as McConnell, further in view of Cisco ("Ethernet Technologies").

As per claims 16,31, although the system disclosed by Choi in view of Schwartz shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the server engine comprises a flattened stack handler for processing an Ethernet packet; a server-side include function; a URL encoder/decoder function; and an electronic mail notification handler.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Choi in view of Schwartz, as evidenced by McConnell.

In an analogous art, McConnell discloses a server (i.e. gateway) that provides an interface to allow access to external entities in a versatile manner (see Abstract). Further showing that the gateway comprises well known server capabilities such as, a flattened stack handler for processing a packet; a server-side include function; a URL encoder/decoder function (see column 5, lines 15-30, *describing different stacks for processing packets (i.e. WDP) and an HTTP client with encoder and a server-side include function in the form an API*); and an electronic mail notification handler (see column 13, lines 9-15, describing how the gateway can be notified if an SMS message is received)).

Given the teaching of McConnell, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Choi in view of Schwartz by employing the above server engine, such as disclosed by McConnell, in order to process tasks that are critical to the function of a server.

In considering the packets being Ethernet packets, Cisco discloses that Ethernet is old and well known for being used as a network (see Background). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to implement the network using Ethernet because it is easy to understand, implement, manage, and maintain (see Cisco page 2, part of "Background", *describing the benefits of using Ethernet*).

As per claims 17,32, Choi in view of Schwartz in view of McConnell in view of Cisco further discloses receiving said Ethernet packet comprising Ethernet header (see Cisco page 5, "Basic Ethernet Frame Format"), IP header, TCP/UDP header, and payload (see McConnell column 5, lines 52-55, where TCP/IP implies a TCP packet which inherently comprises IP header, TCP header and payload); and

processing said payload only if said Ethernet header, said IP header and said UDP/TCP header are associated with an active service at an application layer (see McConnell column 6, lines 5-36, *describing how TCP sockets and ports (implying the Ethernet header, IP heard and TCP header), are only allowed access with an active service with a valid user*).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Philip J Chea
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

PJC 11/23/07

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100